

Staff Response to Comments/Suggestions from the Infill Subcommittee Regarding the Draft Flexible Lot Development

LUC Section	Comment/Suggestion	Staff response
Purpose		
3.6.1.1	<p>1) The development criteria should point at the purpose statement (SMO & Ruth Beeker). If purpose statements are going to be integral to review of projects, must be incorporated into primary text of ordinance. (DW)</p> <p>2) The purpose statements seem to be written for edge development and lacks sufficient language for infill development. (CR)</p>	<p>1) Staff prepared a handout showing the links between the purpose statements and the criteria that support the statements. See Attachment A.</p> <p>2) Purpose statement “I” was added to address efforts toward mitigating the urban heat island effect.</p>
3.6.1.1.C	<p>1) For infill subdivisions, need to make sure common areas are useable (CR)</p> <p>2) Add “desirable” to phrase on consolidating open space (CR)</p> <p>3) Along with preserving open space urban infill should preserve urban features,(historic, walking) in an urban setting (CR)</p>	<p>1) Purpose “C” was rephrased to read: “Providing open space that is usable and includes suitably located recreational amenities, such as trails, walking paths, picnic areas, and playgrounds.”</p> <p>2) Purpose statement amended so that comment no longer applicable.</p> <p>3) The only mechanism staff could identify to address your concerns is the National Register eligibility criteria, which the ordinance already encourages to be preserved (See Purpose statement “A” and Type 2 site description).</p>
3.6.1.1.I	<p>1) Water harvesting, passive solar design, and energy efficiency should be added to purpose statements. (DW)</p> <p>2) Add another purpose statement that reads “obtain sustainability.” (CR)</p> <p>3) Amend purpose statement to read “Providing high-quality development within the city.” (DW)</p>	<p>1) Done</p> <p>2) Rather than add a new purpose statement, sustainability is incorporated into purpose statement “I”</p> <p>3) Done</p>
Applicability		
3.6.1.2.B.1 & 2	<p>1) Clean up LUC references (Sec 3.6.1.4., and .5 and .6) to include commas. (DW)</p> <p>2) Density options that have not been utilized in the past should be removed (Lori Lustig)</p>	<p>1) Done</p> <p>2) The density options will remain as proposed to allow the possibility for these design features to be used in the future.</p>

3.6.1.2.B.2.a (Low Income Housing)	Do not require that units have a specific number of bedrooms (Lori Lustig)	The room requirement has been removed
3.6.1.2.B.2.b (Housing for the Physically Disabled)	<p>1) Take out references to ANSI Standard A117.1 and make it more generic reference to Building Codes (CR). See what building codes says.</p> <p>2) Barrier free ordinance at M&C. Amend ordinance to ensure that density bonus is not given for simply meeting requirements. Need to clarify intent and allow for likely future change. (DW)</p>	<p>1) Done</p> <p>2) Staff is getting clarification</p>
3.6.1.2.B.2.c (Housing for Elderly)	Covenants can be removed, but would still get bonus. Include stronger language. (DW)	In this case, the City would most likely become aware of any change of use because elderly housing usually provides less parking than other residential uses. If a change of use does occur, the property owner is required to seek the appropriate permits from the City which will trigger compliance with the LUC. If a property owner changes the use without acquiring permits, then it becomes a zoning enforcement issue.
3.6.1.2.B.2.d (Historic Preservation)	<p>1) A covenant should be required to preserve historically significant areas. (CR)</p> <p>2) What about urban shrines? (CR)</p>	<p>1) Done</p> <p>2) Need further clarification. If an “urban shrine” is eligible for the National Register then the City will pursue preservation or mitigation.</p>
3.6.1.2.B.2.e (Additional Open Space)	<p>1) Take a look at “strips” that are not usable. Want quality strips. Do not want remnants. (CR)</p> <p>2) What does “natural state” refer to? What is the reason for setting aside? Is it for preservation purposes? (CR & DW)</p> <p>3) Urban features – How about urban features, historic preservation, walkability, sustainable design, plazas, and places for public art. Consider a bullet point for these? (CR)</p>	<p>1) A phrase has been added that reads: “The additional open space must be usable for passive and active recreational uses, such as trails, walking paths, picnic areas, and playgrounds. The additional open space may not be remnant areas.”</p> <p>2) The term “natural state” has been removed to avoid confusion. The purpose for allowing increased density in exchange for additional open space is to encourage developers to factor and design open space into their projects.</p> <p>3) Urban features have been incorporated in various sections of the draft. The density option for “green” building (i.e. sustainable design) has been put back in the ordinance. Historic preservation is already a density option. Walkability is inferred in the proximity to arterial street density option. Plazas and public art</p>

		have been added as permitted amenities within common area, open spaces and recreational amenities.
3.6.1.2.B.2.f (Proximity to Arterial Street)	Check for consistency the Development Standards for pedestrian paths and trails (CR)	Draft amended to remove any inconsistency/ redundancy with other LUC sections.
3.6.1.2.B.2.g (Trail or Wildlife Corridor Dedication)	Has the ratio of 1 unit for 1 acre of trail or wildlife corridor dedication been tested? What is the source? (CR)	The 1:1 ratio has been removed to make it consistent with the other maximum density options.
FLD Review and Approval		
3.6.1.3.A (Project 5 Acres or Less) New section # is 3.6.1.4.A	<p>1) Need to clarify appointment of DHO. It should be through the RFP process and not an appointment by Council or City Manager.</p> <p>2) M&C should appoint design Hearing Officer. (CR, DW, & Bonnie Poulos) Two people should be DRHE's with staggered terms. (CR & DW)</p> <p>3) SAHBA opposed to how projects 5 acres or less can be appealed and the addition of a Design Hearing Officer. (Lori Lustig)</p> <p>4) Can the rezoning and Design Hearing Officer processes be combined? (Mike Grassinger)</p>	<p>1) The DHO will be an outside consultant(s) that will be selected using the City's consultant procurement procedures.</p> <p>2) Staff will research the average number of RCPs submitted each year and estimate the workload creating by the proposed criteria to see if a second DHO is justified.</p> <p>3) FLD projects 5 acres or less are generally going to be urban infill projects that are surrounded by existing uses. The proposed process more greatly ensures that projects are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood by requiring notice, a neighborhood meeting, and a review by DHO. Concerns over compatibility with the existing built environment are usually not as great with FLDs over 5 acres because they are generally built on the edge of town.</p> <p>4) Yes. This will be added as an option; however, any changes to the proposed plan after rezoning and prior to building permit must be reviewed by the DHO.</p>
General Development Criteria		
3.6.1.4.C (Plat or Development Plan Required)	<p>1) Take a look at the process to require all land divisions of an approved FLD. Is it necessary to mention a staff review process? Does not clearly say it does not comply with all subdivision regulations. (CR,DW) New section # is 3.6.1.4.C (FLD Review and Approval)</p> <p>2) This section should require a rezoning. (DW) Review by staff needs to be added. (CR) Include that must meet subdivision requirements. (MM)</p>	<p>1) The item has been amended to specify that staff review and compliance with subdivision regulations is required.</p> <p>2) Further division of land and re-subdivisions must comply with the underlying zoning; therefore, a</p>

	<p>3) Not all developers process their plans to the level of specificity required by the FLD before selling property to a builder(s). Can a note be added to the plat requiring subsequent housing plans to comply with FLD regulations? (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>4) Allow alternative compliance (i.e. a process by which an applicant can request an administrative waiver from the standards in the FLD) (Lori Lustig)</p> <p>5) Use guidelines rather than standards. If the use of standards is taken forward, SAHBA would prefer to keep the original RCP as it is. (Lori Lustig)</p> <p>6) Will home builders and property owners have to go through public hearing process in order to get housing plans approved? (Jim Campbell)</p>	<p>rezoning is not necessary. In the event that the resulting density caused by the division of land exceeds the permitted zoning density limits, then a rezoning would be required.</p> <p>3) Yes. See 3.6.1.3.A.1.</p> <p>4) The FLD already provides significant flexibility beyond standard subdivision criteria. Modifications to the FLD criteria can be requested through the variance process. See response to #5 below for additional rationale.</p> <p>5) Staff is proceeding with using standards because standards result in greater consistency and predictability from project to project in regards to the review process and what is permitted. Guidelines, while providing greater flexibility, creates greater uncertainty among staff, development community, and neighborhoods as to what to expect during review and what will be perceived as acceptable.</p> <p>6) No. An exception to this is if the developer sells the property to a homebuilder prior to approval of a site design plan.</p>
3.6.1.4.D (FLD Site Design Plan Required)	<p>1) Clarify entire section regarding identifying environmentally sensitive and culturally sensitive features. (DW)</p> <p>2) D.1 – Are slopes calculated on the average of the whole site or feature itself? (DW)</p> <p>3) D.3 – Demonstrate how FLD complies with 3.6.1.6.E 9 (Architectural Design), General Plan and applicable neighborhood plans. How does one comply with this? (DW)</p>	<p>1) Ask DW what specifically needs clarification.</p> <p>2) Slopes are calculated on the feature itself. This is a change from how slopes have been calculated in the past, which allowed an average cross slope analysis based on the entire site.</p> <p>3) Staff reviews all plats, development plans, and site design plans in accordance with applicable area and neighborhood plans. If a development application is inconsistent with applicable plans, then the applicant</p>

	4) D.4, 5, 6, & E – What about natural open space? Need to define “natural undisturbed open space.” (CR)	<p>must either amend the plan or modify the proposed project.</p> <p>4) “Natural undisturbed open space” is defined as “any area of land that is unimproved and not occupied by structures or man-made impervious surfaces that is set aside, dedicated or reserved in perpetuity as a preservation conservation area for public or private enjoyment. A pedestrian or non-motorized access trail may be located in a natural undisturbed open space. Rights-of-ways (including alleys) and utility easements are prohibited in a natural undisturbed open space.”</p>
3.6.1.4.E (Project Amenities and Site Improvements)	1) Need to have a NUOS definition and a clearer definition of common area. (CR)	<p>1) See 3.6.1.4.D (FLD Site Design Plan Required), #4 for definition of “natural undisturbed open space.”</p> <p>“Common area” is defined as “a general term referring to those portions of a site not within the boundaries of a private lot that are set aside in perpetuity as commonly owned and maintained by the residents of a development through a homeowners organization, and designated for the benefit of and enjoyment by all the residents of the development. Common area is comprised of open space, functional open space and areas for infrastructure such as streets, alleys, and drainage easements.</p> <p>Common open space is defined as “the portion of a site that is set aside in perpetuity as open space, commonly owned and maintained by the residents of a development through a homeowners organization, and designated for the benefit of and enjoyment by all the residents of the development. Common area, open space includes landscaped areas which provide visual relief, shade, screening, buffering and other environmental amenity. Rights-of-way are not included in open space and/or common area calculations.”</p> <p>Open space, functional. Open space that is a designed element of the development and has a functionally</p>

		described and planned use as an amenity for the direct benefit of the residents of a development, with not more than three percent of man-made impervious surface within such designated areas. Examples include landscaped areas which provide visual relief, shade, screening, buffering and other environmental amenity; nature trails; exercise trails; open playgrounds, such as baseball, multiuse; picnic areas and facilities; recreation areas and facilities, such as swimming pools, tennis courts; and golf courses.
	2) Project amenities should include landscaping . (CR)	2) Landscaping has been added.
3.6.1.4.F (Open Space Requirements)	<p>1) F.1 – The clustering limitation of 2-10 units for Type 1 sites is too restrictive. (Mike Barush)</p> <p>2) F.1 & 2 – The term “environmentally sensitive” needs to be clarified to include specifics such as environmental resource zones, protected peaks, and slopes. (Mike Barush)</p> <p>3) F.2 – Type 2 (disturbed with less than 30% natural area) sites should give an incentive to preserve the undisturbed area of the site. (CR) Need to clean up wording. (?) (DW)</p> <p>4) F.4 – Unclear what the term “non-motorized trails” means. (MMcC)</p> <p>5) F.5 – Section appears to unintentionally prohibit public streets by saying all land outside of lots is common area. (McC) There needs to be a consistent term for common area vs. common area open space.</p>	<p>1) The 2-10 unit requirement has been removed.</p> <p>2) Done.</p> <p>3) Type 2 sites will typically be urban infill sites where the maximization of density is encouraged. As a result, the undisturbed areas of the site not required to be preserved per existing overlays (e.g. environmental resource zone, hillside development zone, scenic corridor zone, etc.) may be developed.</p> <p>4) "Non-motorized recreational trail" is defined as an “easement used by pedestrians, equestrians, bicyclists (including electric if local regulations permit) and wheelchairs (including electric). Motorized maintenance vehicles are permitted on trails for maintenance purposes only.”</p> <p>5) F.5 has been reworded to read: <i>“Definition of Common Open Space.</i> Open space is any portion of the FLD project site that is: a. Outside the boundaries of a private lot; b. Not a street or alley; c. Commonly owned and maintained by a</p>

	<p>6) F.6 – Clarify Sections 3.6.1.4.F.6 & 3.6.1.4.I.2 refer to post-development floodplain since often times sheet-flow type floodplains are channelized as part of the development plan. (Mike Barush)</p> <p>7) F.8 – Configuration of open space. Need to make sure that unusable strips are not permitted. (CR)</p> <p>8) F.8 – “Open space shall not be part of private lots.” (CR)</p> <p>9) F.8 – For FLD projects over 50 lots, allow option of creating a single centralized park/open space amenity or a relatively uniform distribution of pocket parks. Amend section to state that, for FLD project over 50 lots, open space comprised of multiple smaller amenities scattered throughout the site must have at least 1 open space equal to the average lot size and containing an active recreation amenity. This could include the shared use of a drainage basin. (Mike Barush)</p>	<p>homeowners organization in perpetuity; and,</p> <p>d. Designated for the benefit of and enjoyment by all the residents of the development.”</p> <p>See response to 3.6.1.4.E (Project Amenities and Site Improvements), #1 for clarification on common area issue.</p> <p>6) Channelizing drainage is permitted in FLD projects when no adverse impacts are created. The channelized area, however, can not be used in meeting open space requirements.</p> <p>7) A criteria has been added requiring that 60% of the area designated as common area, open space be functional open space as defined under common area, recreational.</p> <p>8) Resolved in F.5. See F.5 for response.</p> <p>9) Requiring 60% of common area, open space to be functional provides the flexibility to accommodate both consolidated and pocket parks. See #7 for response.</p>
<p>3.6.1.4.G (Recreational Amenities)</p> <p>Recreational Amenities have been incorporated into the Common Open Space section (3.6.1.5.F) and re-named “Functional Open Space”</p>	<p>1) G.1 – Recreation area may not be needed if project is in vicinity of park or school with playground space. Flexibility in FLD needs to account for this. (Janet Marcus)</p> <p>2) G.1 – If no amenities provided, needs to be offset with landscaping to make palatable to neighborhood. (Bonnie Poulos)</p> <p>3) G.1 – RX-1 and RX-2 should be exempt from rec. area requirements since minimum lot size is 18,000 SF and 16,000 SF respectively. (Mike Grassinger)</p> <p>4) G.3 – Reword first sentence to read “...to provide usable edge</p>	<p>1) The criterion has been amended to include a stipulation that if a FLD project is located within one-quarter mile of a City park, then recreational amenities are not required.</p> <p>2) Open space, amenities, and/or buffering will be required as part of every FLD.</p> <p>3) Done</p> <p>4) Done</p>

	<p>transition...” (SMO)</p> <p>5) G.3 – Consider requiring a density setback rather than edge transition setback. (CR)</p> <p>6) G.3 – If a project is of similar density and use why should there be any buffer between a new home and an existing home other than perhaps a setback similar to the typical setback observed within the existing neighborhood? (Mike Barush)</p> <p>7) G.3 – Whenever possible, look for opportunities to combine buffers and walking paths in infill developments. Thus make sure all buffers are wide enough for this purpose. (SMO)</p> <p>8) G.3 & 4 – Consider using number of lots to trigger recreational area requirements similar to Pima County instead of acreage. (Mike Grassinger)</p> <p>9) G.4 – Is there a maximum project area for FLDs? (CR)</p> <p>10) G.4 – Recreation area requirements are too proscriptive. Cases in</p>	<p>5) <i>UNDER CONSIDERATION</i>. Staff is considering amending the setback requirements on sites 5 acres and less so that the City’s architect will determine the setback. This change would allow for greater flexibility in determining the appropriate setback given the surrounding uses and their intensity. Guidelines will be added to ensure that the proposed FLD is compatible with the adjacent area such as privacy, screening, and the lot to lot ratio of proposed vs. existing adjacent lots. This change is consistent with Pima County’s requirements which allows a review committee to determine the minimum setback requirements. The setbacks must be consistent with the requirements of Major Streets and Scenic Routes Plan and the Arizona Department of Health Services.</p> <p>6) See response to #5.</p> <p>7) Statements have been added to the draft encouraging, but not requiring, buffers to be utilized for trails and walkways. The 60% functional open space requirement will also encourage developers to make buffers functional.</p> <p>8) Staff has significantly reconfigured the common open space and recreational area requirements (now known as functional open space) sections. Common open space requirements are now based on a sliding scale based on the number of lots and are triggered on sites with 30 or more lots. 60% of common open space must be functional.</p> <p>9) No</p> <p>10) See response to #8.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>point: Camino Seco Village – 17,000 SF would be required or approximately 3.5 lots = would kill project. (Jim Campbell) Williams Center – provided 17,000 SF, FLD would require 75,000 SF. (Mike Barush)</p> <p>11) G.4 – When determining the recreational area requirements, consider using a sliding scale where the square footage per unit requirement decreases as the number of units within the FLD project increases. Consider mandating a tot lot or par course, depending on the market, and then adding an amount of grass at 100+ units or some similar menu similar to Pima County’s requirements. (Mike Barush)</p> <p>12) G.7 – Require that detention/retention be commonly owned and on a private lot. Need to make sure the retention/detention cannot be part of the adjacent lot (DW)</p> <p>13) Disagree with 60% functional. I would delete the percentage completely as it is very hard to determine. If I have an acre and a trail cuts across a 1/4 of it does the whole thing count as functional. Also the definition needs to be clear. Functional open space needs to be more flexible..."for the common use of the residents whether it be active recreational, passive recreational or scenic". A bench sitting in an acre oasis should be considered passive functional. (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>14) Parks and Rec already approves functional open space within plats. As long as the definition is clear so staff understands this. (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>15) In general the whole discussion around Functional Open Space needs to be clear, concise and not burdensome. (Jim Campbell)</p>	<p>11) Under consideration</p> <p>12) G.7 has been amended to include “retention/detention facilities shall be located in an easement outside the boundaries of a private lot, commonly owned, and maintained by the homeowners organization.”</p> <p>13) 60% REQUIREMENT UNDER CONSIDERATION. Suggested language has been incorporated to clarify the definition of functional open space.</p> <p>14) Definition has been clarified.</p> <p>15) SECTION UNDER REVIEW</p>
<p>3.6.1.4.I (Calculation of Maximum Unit Yield)</p> <p>Section ref # revised to 3.6.1.5.I</p>	<p>I.2) You are taking away floodplain in the # of lots calculation. This is a takeaway and different than code today. If 75% is floodplain and you can create a dense neighborhood with 75% open space what is wrong with that????</p> <p>I.4) Reconsider allowing the density calculation to be rounded up. Illustrations would be helpful to describe density. (DW)</p>	<p>I.2) This requirement has been removed.</p> <p>I.4) The resulting density still has to be within the density limits permitted by the underlying zoning. Rounding up at .5 and above is standard procedure.</p>
3.6.1.4.J (Flexible Lot	Stating that under straight FLD developers are not getting density bonus is	FLD are not permitted to exceed the density criteria

Design Project Density Matrix)	erroneous. Any FLD is getting a density bonus above regular zoning. (Ruth Beeker)	established by the underlying zoning. In fact, even under the density bonus option, the maximum density achieved is no greater than that of the underlying zoning. What may create this perception is that existing surrounding development is not built to maximum allowable density limits coupled with the fact that proposed FLDs may reduce the minimum lot size.
Site Specific Development Criteria		
3.6.1.5.A (Transition Edge Treatment and Mitigation for Adjacent Properties) New section # is 3.6.1.6.A	<p>1) A. Delete reference to residential. Reword to say "...buffering, screening, or orientation elements." (CR). Add "other objectionable issues" to transition list of adverse impacts (DW/CR).</p> <p>2) A.1 – Add language regarding providing privacy through screening and orientation (CR)</p> <p>3) A.1.b.ii – Where there are National registered or 'recognized' building. Re-word to reflect National Register language more clearly. (DW) Change "should" to "shall"</p> <p>4) A.2.b – Need illustrations (DW).</p> <p>5) A.2.c.i – 6-foot wall. Is this consistent with the LUC and other Dev't Standards? Consider removing 6' wall requirement. Too proscriptive. (CR)</p> <p>6) Design needs to be compatible with existing residential. This needs to be clearer. What does this mean? I could see a staff member saying it needs to have the same look and feel and a production builder saying I can't build down that much. (Jim Campbell)</p>	<p>1) Done</p> <p>2) Done</p> <p>3) Done</p> <p>4) Staff will consider incorporating illustrations with future amendments to the FLD; however, given the pressing deadline for the proposed changes, illustrations will not be added at this time.</p> <p>5) Staff has amended the section to remove the 10-foot landscape buffer option; therefore requiring a 6-foot wall.</p> <p>6) Requirement has been amended to clarify that FLD projects must be compatible with architectural design features of the surrounding area and that FLD residences abutting existing single story residences must also be single story.</p>
3.6.1.5.B (Landscaping, Screening, and Wall Requirements) New section # is	<p>1) Are all the landscaping provisions consistent with the landscaping regulations in the LUC and Dev't Standards? (CR)</p> <p>2) B.4 – Reference to canopy tree. Is it consistent with landscaping</p>	<p>1) COMMENTS 1-3 ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION. THE COMMITTEE WILL BE UPDATED OF ANY REVISIONS.</p> <p>2) See response to #1</p>

<p>3.6.1.6.B</p>	<p>standards in LUC etc? If different, change to be consistent. (CR)</p> <p>3) I had this issue last week. Can't you simply state that you need to have a tree for every X square feet or x lots...with the majority along walkways? For townhomes you sometimes can't place a tree in the front so staff makes you redesign the house rather than allow flexibility with trees. (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>4) 50% shaded. This is an impossible requirement and conflicts with the earlier tree requirement. This would mean a tree every 25 feet or so. Big Issue!! (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>5) B.5 – Add recycling receptacles. (CR)</p> <p>6) Dumpsters within 50 feet of residential uses. This should be 50 feet from residential lots to be clear. Common could be construed to have a residential use. (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>7) B8 Change reference to mobile homes to manufactured housing (DW/CR)</p>	<p>3) See response to #1</p> <p>4) Draft has been amended to require canopy trees at least every 40 feet along pedestrian circulation systems.</p> <p>5) Done</p> <p>6) Requirement has been amended to clarify that dumpsters must be at least 50 feet away from residences.</p> <p>7) Done</p>
<p>3.6.1.5.C (Perimeter Yard Table)</p> <p>New section # is 3.6.1.6.C</p>	<p>Should show the full table or not at all. Consider removing cross referenced tables OR remove and reference to same table in other section of LUC (CR, MMc, DW)</p>	<p>The table has been removed from the draft.</p>
<p>3.6.1.5.E (Parking)</p> <p>New section # is 3.6.1.6.E</p>	<p>1) E.1 & 2 – Provide illustrations or reference where illustrations can be found (DW)</p> <p>2) E.1 – Delete outside in the phrase “the on-street parking outside the FLD site...” (CR)</p> <p>3) E.2 – Need to check lane widths referring to City traffic standards. (DW)</p> <p>4) E.2 - "...designed with parking lanes." Parking lanes limit the use of bumpouts for trees, landscaping, etc. As long as the parking is handled it should not matter if it is a continuous lane.</p> <p>5) E.4 – Need to clarify role of alleys. Need to be clear as to whether they can be used for open space or not. (DW)</p>	<p>1) Adding illustrations will be considered as part of future amendments to the FLD.</p> <p>2) Done.</p> <p>3) This requirement does not exempt FLDs from meeting traffic design standards.</p> <p>4) The draft does not preclude parking lanes from including bumpouts from landscaping.</p> <p>5) Alleys are included in common area calculations, but may not be used toward satisfying open space</p>

	<p>6) E.4.a – Delete “residential”</p> <p>7) E.4.b – Should delete reference to must be paved and include curbs (CR) 16’ width rule per DoT???</p> <p>8) E.5.b – Acronym PAAL note word (DW)</p> <p>9) Provide definition of alley. (CR)</p>	<p>requirements.</p> <p>6) Reexamine need for E.4.b. Appears to contradict with other criteria in that same section.</p> <p>7) Amended to read “alleys shall comply with Department of Transportation’s design criteria.”</p> <p>8) Done. PAAL (i.e. parking area access lane) is spelled out in the ordinance.</p> <p>9) The definition of “alley” is located in the Definitions section of the LUC and is defined as “a public way primarily for placement of utilities, refuse collection, or similar public services.”</p>
<p>3.6.1.5.F (Circulation and Connectivity)</p> <p>New section # is 3.6.1.6.F</p>	<p>1) F.2 – Include open space. Regarding pedestrian circulation system. Need consistent terms and need to be consistent with the Development Standards. (CR)</p> <p>2) F.5 – Need to make sure that Barrier free is consistent with Building codes regulations. Change phrase “physically disabled” to “accessible to the physically disabled” & “...wide path that is accessible to physically disabled...” (DW/CR)</p> <p>3) F.5 – Require compliance with ADA in addition to the criteria in this subsection. (Bonnie Poulos)</p> <p>4) F.5.b & c – Does this section require a paved, accessible path everywhere a decomposed granite jogging trail is provided? If so, developers will minimize trails in the project, which in turn will limit, not encourage jogging and dog-walking loops. (Mike Barush)</p>	<p>1) A criterion was added to Section 3.6.1.5.B (Landscaping) requiring that pedestrian circulation systems be at least 50% shaded by tree canopy. Staff will investigate and correct any inconsistencies.</p> <p>2) Done</p> <p>3) References throughout the draft ordinance have been changed to cite the Building Code rather than specific standards such as ANSI and ADA. The Building Code includes ANSI and ADA requirements and is updated regularly to reflect changes in standards.</p> <p>4) No. The ordinance prevents decomposed granite paths only from being constructed in an FLD project. If a decomposed granite trail is proposed, then a pedestrian path that is accessible to the physically disabled must also be proposed. Additionally, trails within open space areas – regardless of whether they are accessible to the physically disabled – must be connected to pedestrian paths in the FLD by a path that</p>

	<p>5) Trails within open space to be all-weather is contrary to what Pima County wants. If it is a natural area than they expect it to be kept natural unless it is connected to a larger trail system. Pedestrian paths can be all-weather but trails should be left natural. (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>5) F.6 – Change phrase a “ten year flow” to “the flow for a 10-year event” (DW)</p>	<p>is physically disabled accessible.</p> <p>5) The draft does not state that trails must be constructed of all-weather materials. Rather, the path connecting pedestrian pathways to trails must be constructed of all-weather materials.</p> <p>5) Done</p>
<p>3.6.1.5.G (Terrain and Grading)</p> <p>New section # is 3.6.1.6.G</p>	G.2 – Spell out acronyms	Done
Individual Lot Development Criteria		
<p>3.6.1.6.D (Perimeter Yards Within Site Boundaries)</p> <p>New section # is 3.6.1.7.D</p>	<p>1) D.1 – Allow zero lot line setbacks to maximize flexibility for attached unit projects. (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>2) D.2 – Add phrase “compliant w/ the traffic engineering policy notwithstanding.” (DW)</p>	<p>1) As currently proposed, zero lot lines may be administratively authorized by the Director of DSD.</p> <p>2) Done</p>
<p>3.6.1.6.E (Architectural Design)</p> <p>New section # is 3.6.1.7.E</p>	<p>1) The whole section needs to be re-worded and edited. Make sure it is internally and externally consistent with the LUC and the Dev Standards (CR)</p> <p>2) Clarify which criteria apply to the edge of the FLD project and those that apply to the interior of the project.</p> <p>3) E.2 – Repetition is not necessarily the same as monotony (e.g. rows of Georgian townhomes in London). (Mike Barush)</p> <p>4) E.2 - As discussed there should a matrix that says "no more than four of the same designs for every ten lots." You need to increase the sample size to increase randomness. Randomness should be a stated goal. (Jim Campbell)</p> <p>5) E.3 – Change “model” to read “elevation.” Some builders may build the</p>	<p>1) Clarification needed from CR.</p> <p>2) Staff has provided clarification throughout the section to clarify which criteria apply internally and along the perimeter of the project.</p> <p>3) While this may be true of well designed attached housing, the same is generally not perceived to be true of single family detached residences.</p> <p>4) Draft has been amended to allow no more that four of the same design for every ten lots, but a condition was added that no more than two residences with the same elevation may be adjacent to one another.</p> <p>5) Done</p>

	<p>same model, but with different elevations. (Mike Grassinger)</p> <p>6) E.3 – Reduce requirement to two of the items listed OR keep the requirement at three but add another option. (Bonnie Poulos)</p> <p>7) E.5.c – Clarify where garages can be located and whether rear loaded garages are required</p> <p>8) "...no more than two abutting units use the same garage placement. This bans auto-courts which is problematic. The key here is to limit front loaded garages and to vary the look. So why are you trying to ban auto-courts where you can't even see the garage. PLEASE delete the last line and allow the 50% limit on front loaded (flush or sticking out) stand alone. (Jim Campbell)</p>	<p>6) "Exterior color" has been added as an additional option. Applicants must now satisfy at least 3 of the 6 options provided in E.3.</p> <p>7) References to "front loaded garages" have been deleted to avoid further confusion. The section has been reworded to clarify that limits only apply to those residential units with garages that face the street and protrude from or is flush with the front wall of the living area.</p> <p>8) The draft has been amended to read: "The elevations of homes should vary throughout the FLD project so that more than two (2) abutting units use the same garage placement configuration."</p>
Phasing Requirements		
3.6.1.8 (FLD Phasing Requirements)	B – Clean up cross references in (MMc)	Done. The reference to Section 3.6.1.7 has been removed.
New section # is 3.6.1.9		
Definitions		
6.2	<p>1) Open space natural – Check other LUC references the term "essentially unimproved" seems too broad.</p> <p>2) Clarify that there is a desire to keep open space, natural as natural open space but allow trails. What does "unimproved" mean? (DW)</p>	<p>1) Term "essentially unimproved" removed from revised definition.</p> <p>2) The definition as written satisfies this comment. "Unimproved" means undisturbed, not developed or not enhanced.</p>